



**REVISED APPLICATION
HIGHWAY & ACCESS CONCERNS**
Gladman Planning Application HPK/2014/0119
Linglongs Road - South of Macclesfield Road



Please Email jane.colley@highpeak.gov.uk

In Writing to: Jane Colley, Senior Planning Officer, Planning Applications,
High Peak Borough Council, PO Box 136, Buxton, Derbyshire, SK17 1AQ.

NEEDS TO GET TO HPBC BEFORE 18th JULY 2014

**F.A.O. Jane Colley, Senior Planning Officer
Planning Application HPK/2014/0119 Linglongs Road Whaley Bridge**

I strongly object to the above Planning Application for the following reasons:-

- Major safety concerns for vehicles turning right into Linglongs Road – not addressed from the DCC Highways Report TP58580 dated October 2012.
- It is proposed to increase Linglongs Road carriageway to 5.5m wide and provide 2.0m width footways to each side for a proportion of the road. However it is not planned to provide **ANY** improvements to Linglongs Road between the northern extent of the site frontage and Macclesfield Road. The recent DCC Highways Report specified improvements to the full length of Linglongs Road. This has not been satisfied in the revised application.
- No Footpath on residents' side of Linglongs Road or for people crossing at the junction - particularly dangerous for children at peak times.
- Exit visibility splays still remain severely deficient for 7 private driveways on Linglongs Road - issues not addressed as identified in recent DCC Highways Report.
- Speed hump on Linglongs Road causing additional noise pollution for existing residents.
- Increase in volume of traffic on Linglongs Road resulting in loss of amenity for residents due to major highway safety concerns and noise pollution.
- No safe crossing point on Macclesfield Road for pedestrians. For every 100 houses there are approximately 20 primary school and 15 secondary school children – Puffin crossing now removed.
- DCC Highways Report suggests that people will use vehicles to travel rather than walk – this contradicts Gladman Application which strongly suggests walking and cycling – hence not sustainable.
- Proposed **NEW VEHICLE ACCESS POINT** at a narrow, steep section of Macclesfield Road between 84-90 Macclesfield Road where visibility is very limited and would endanger cyclists, pedestrians and drivers. Stopping vehicles, backing up traffic and increasing congestion.
- Residents who currently park opposite 84-90 Macclesfield Road will be displaced onto Reddish Lane and Reddish Road due to new entrance. Loss of amenity for residents on **Reddish Lane, Reddish Road and Mereside Gardens** due to additional congestion.
- Traffic slowing on/just around a blind corner, up the hill, to turn into the new entrance.
- Large vehicles needing to cross the centre line into the path of traffic coming downhill to make the turn to new entrance.
- Houses on the even side of Macclesfield Road, no. 84 and below, being on an 'island' of roads with extremely narrow footpaths – hence **no safe route for children to walk to school**.
- Unsafe crossing arrangements on Macclesfield Road at no. 84 (proximity to blind corner).
- Creating a new main vehicular route which passes immediately behind back gardens (no. 84-104) - noise impact.
- Raising of ground levels at the proposed new entrance to above the height of existing boundary walls - noise/privacy impact. + INCREASED RISK OF FLOODING TO NO 84 FROM ROAD WATER.
- Issue of vehicles travelling downhill making right turn into new entrance has not been addressed.
- Previously 'green' proposed pedestrian corridor into site would be overdeveloped.
- The station car park is full to capacity; cars already park on main road towards Tesco causing severe congestion. There is no provision for additional parking in the town to meet further demand.
- NO MENTION OF EXISTING DISABLED PARKING BAYS OPPOSITE NO 84 & 90. ??

Signed: _____

Name: _____

Address: _____

Please copy us in as we would like to assess the number of letters to the council:

whaleybridgematters@gmail.com

C. Mail:- jandkashan@gmail.com

P.T.O.

14/07/14

THE THOUGHT OF THE NEW PROPOSED ONE WAY
ENTRANCE AND THAT POINT OF MACCLESFIELD ROAD
WILL IMMEDIATELY CREATE "AN ACCIDENT WAITING
TO HAPPEN" AND A CERTAIN ACCIDENT BLACKSPOT.
NOBODY IN THEIR RIGHT MIND WOULD CONSIDER AN
ENTRANCE TO A HOUSING ESTATE AT A POINT
ON A BEND ON A STEEP HILL THAT WILL REQUIRE
LARGE VEHICLES HAVING TO ENCROACH ON THE WRONG SIDE
OF THE ROAD TO NECESSITATE A SUFFICIENT TURNING ARCH
TO ENABLE ACCESS. LET ALONE THE DANGER OF
VEHICLES TRYING TO TURN RIGHT COMING DOWN
MACCLESFIELD ~~RIGHT~~ ROAD TRYING TO GAIN ACCESS. IF.

ALSO AS A DISABLED DRIVER MYSELF, NO MENTION IS
MADE OF THE 3 DISABLED PARKING BAYS OPPOSITE NOS 84 & 90 ARE THESE
DRIVERS ALSO EXPECTED TO PARK ON REDDISH ROAD OR REDDISH LANE??

IT TAKES DISABLED DRIVERS LONGER TO ENTER AND EXIT THEIR
VEHICLES AND AGAIN ANY ADDED 'RISK/DANGER' FROM THIS NEW
JUNCTION WOULD ~~ADD~~ ONLY INCREASE THE DANGER TO THESE
ESSENTIAL CAR USERS - SURELY THIS IS A BREACH OF THEIR VITAL
AMENITIES.

PLEASE EMAIL ME ANY FURTHER DEVELOPEMENT AND
TO :- jandkashten@gmail.com. CONFIRMATION OF
RECEIPT
MANY THANKS.